arXiv:1211.4677v1 [math.NA] 20 Nov 2012

THE LOWER BOUND OF THE ERROR ESTIMATE IN THE L^2 NORM FOR THE ADINI ELEMENT OF THE BIHARMONIC EQUATION

JUN HU AND ZHONGCI SHI

Abstract. This paper is devoted to the error estimate in the L^2 norm of the Adini element on the uniform mesh for the biharmonic equation. Surprisingly, a lower bound of the error estimate in the L^2 norm is established which proves that the convergence rate in the L^2 norm can not be higher than that in the energy norm. Let h be the meshsize of the triangulation, by the usual Poincare inequality, this implies that the best error estimate in the H^1 norm is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$, which proves that convergence rates in both L^2 and H^1 norms are the same as that in the energy norm. This solves one long standing open problem whether convergence rates in L^2 and H^1 norms are higher than that in the energy norm, such a problem in fact dates back to the pioneering error analysis presented in [Lascaux and Lesaint, Some nonconforming finite elements for the plate bending problem, RAIRO Anal. Numer. 9 (1975), pp. 9–53.] for this element.

1. Introduction

For the numerical analysis of the finite element method for the fourth order elliptic problem, one fundamental problem unsolved is the error estimate in the L^2 norm [1, 3, 14]. In a recent paper [7], we analyzed several mostly popular lower order elements: the Powell-Sabin $C^1 - P_2$ macro element [12], the nonconforming Morley element [11, 16, 14, 17], the $C^1 - Q_2$ macro element [6], the nonconforming rectangle Morley element [15], and the nonconforming incomplete biquadratic element [13, 18]. In particular, we proved that the possibly best error estimate in the L^2 norm for these elements is at most of second order and can not be two order higher than that in the energy norm.

On the uniform mesh, the error estimate in the energy norm of the Adini element [1, 3, 8, 14] is of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ provided that the exact

---

Date: November 21, 2012.

The research was supported by the NSFC Project 10971005. The research of the first author was supported by the NSFC Project 11271035, and in part by the NSFC Key Project 11031006.

solution has the H^4 regularity [8, 9, 10]; cf. [4, 19] for the eigenvalue problem, where h denotes the meshsize of the triangulation under consideration. Consequently, the Adini element is in some sense a high order method for this case. Hence, by the usual Aubin-Nitsche trick, it *seems* that error estimates in L^2 and H^1 norms must be higher than $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. However, such an analysis can not be found in the literature so far. Therefore, it is still open whether error estimates in both L^2 and H^1 norms are higher than that in the energy norm for this element on the uniform mesh.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the error estimate in the L^2 norm for the Adini element [1, 3, 8, 14]. There are two main ingredients for the analysis. One is a refined property of the canonical interpolation operator, which will be proved by a new expansion method. The other is an identity for $(-f, e)_{L^2(\Omega)}$, where f is the right-hand side function and e is the error. Such an identity separates the dominant term from the other higher order terms, which is the key to use the aforementioned refined property of the interpolation operator. Based on these factors, a lower bound of the error estimate in the L^2 norm is surprisingly established which proves that the best error estimate in the L^2 norm is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. Thus, by the usual Poincare inequality, this indicates that the best error estimate in the H^1 norm is also at most of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. Therefore, convergence rates in both L^2 and H^1 norms are the same as that in the energy norm and can not be higher any more. This solves one long standing open problem whether convergence rates in L^2 and H^1 norms are higher than that in the energy norm, such a problem in fact dates back to the pioneering error analysis presented in [Lascaux and Lesaint, Some nonconforming finite elements for the plate bending problem, RAIRO Anal. Numer. 9 (1975), pp. 9–53.] for this element. The result herein explains the numerical result in [9].

The paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we shall present the biharmonic equation and the nonconforming Adini element. In Section 3, we define some interpolation operators and analyze their properties. In Section 4, we establish an identity for $(-f, e)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and prove the main result that the error estimate in the L^2 norm has a lower bound which indicates that convergence rates in both L^2 and H^1 norms are at most of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. In Section 5, we end this paper by the conclusion and some comments.

2. The biharmonic equation and nonconforming Adini element method

We consider the model fourth order elliptic problem: Given $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ find $w \in W := H_0^2(\Omega)$, such that

$$a(w, v) := (\nabla^2 w, \nabla^2 v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for any } v \in W. \tag{2.1}$$

where $\nabla^2 w$ denotes the Hessian matrix of the function w.

To consider the discretization of (2.1) by the Adini element method, let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a regular uniform rectangular triangulation of the domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ in the two dimensions. Given $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let (x_c, y_c) be the center of K, the horizontal length $2h_x$, the vertical length $2h_y$, which define the meshsize $h := \max(h_x, h_y)$ and affine mapping:

$$\xi := \frac{x - x_c}{h_x}, \quad \eta := \frac{y - y_c}{h_y} \text{ for any } (x, y) \in K. \tag{2.2}$$

On element K, the shape function space of the Adini element reads [1, 3, 8, 14]

$$Q_{Ad}(K) := P_3(K) + \operatorname{span}\{x^3 y, y^3 x\}\,, \tag{2.3}$$

here and throughout this paper, $P_\ell(K)$ denotes the space of polynomials of degree $\leq \ell$ over K. The nonconforming Adini element space W_h is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} W_h := \ & \big\{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_K \in Q_{Ad}(K) \text{ for each } K \in \mathcal{T}_h, v \text{ and } \nabla v \text{ is continuous} \\ & \quad \text{at the internal nodes, and vanishes at the boundary nodes on } \partial\Omega\big\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

The finite element approximation of Problem (2.1) reads: Find $w_h \in W_h$, such that

$$a_h(w_h, v_h) := (\nabla_h^2 w_h, \nabla_h^2 v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for any } v_h \in w_h\,, \tag{2.4}$$

where the operator ∇_h^2 is the discrete counterpart of ∇^2, which is defined element by element since the discrete space w_h is nonconforming.

3. Interpolation operators and refined properties

This section defines some interpolation operators and establishes the lower bound of $a_h(w - \Pi_h w, \Pi_h w)$ which is one main ingredient for the analysis of this paper. Here Π_h is the canonical interpolation operator defined as in (3.3) below,

Given $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, define the interpolation operator $\Pi_K : H^3(K) \to Q_{Ad}(K)$ by, for any $v \in H^3(K)$,

$$(\Pi_K v)(P) = v(P) \text{ and } \nabla(\Pi_K v)(P) = \nabla v(P) \tag{3.1}$$

for any vertex P of K. The interpolation Π_K has the following estimates [1, 3, 8, 14]:

$$|v-\Pi_K v|_{H^\ell(K)}\leq Ch^{4-\ell}|v|_{H^4(K)}, \ell=1,2,3,4\,, \tag{3.2}$$

provided that $v\in H^4(K)$. Herein and throughout this paper, C denotes a generic positive constant which is independent of the meshsize and may be different at different places. Then the global version Π_h of the interpolation operator Π_K is defined as

$$\Pi_h|_K=\Pi_K \text{ for any } K\in\mathcal{T}_h. \tag{3.3}$$

In the following, let $\nabla^\ell v$ denote the ℓ-th order tensor of all ℓ-th order derivatives of v, for instance, $\ell=1$ the gradient, and $\ell=2$ the Hessian matrix, and that ∇_h^ℓ are the piecewise counterparts of ∇^ℓ defined element by element.

Given any element K, we follow [5, 7] to define $P_K v\in P_4(K)$ by

$$\int_K \nabla^\ell P_K v dxdy=\int_K \nabla^\ell v dxdy, \ell=0,1,2,3,4, \tag{3.4}$$

for any $v\in H^4(K)$. Note that the operator P_K is well-posed. It follows from the very definition of P_K in (3.4) that

$$\nabla^4 P_K v=\Pi_{0,K}\nabla^4 v \tag{3.5}$$

with $\Pi_{0,K}$ the L^2 constant projection operator over K. Then the global version Π_0 of the interpolation operator $\Pi_{0,K}$ is defined as

$$\Pi_0|_K=\Pi_{0,K} \text{ for any } K\in\mathcal{T}_h. \tag{3.6}$$

Lemma 3.1. *For any $u\in P_4(K)$ and $v\in Q_{Ad}(K)$, there holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla^2(u-\Pi_K u),\nabla^2 v)_{L^2(K)}=&-\frac{h_y^2}{3}\int_K\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2\partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}dxdy\\&-\frac{h_x^2}{3}\int_K\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2\partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2}dxdy.\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Let ξ and η be defined as in (2.2). It follows from the definition of $Q_{Ad}(K)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}=a_0+a_1\xi+a_2\eta+a_3\xi\eta,\\&\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2}=b_0+b_1\xi+b_2\eta+b_3\xi\eta,\\&\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x\partial y}=c_0+c_1\xi+c_2\eta+c_3\xi^2+c_4\eta^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

for some interpolation parameters a_i, b_i, $i = 0, \cdots, 3$, and c_i, $i = 0, \cdots, 4$. Since $u \in P_4(K)$, the Taylor expansion and the definition of the operator Π_K yield

$$\begin{aligned} u - \Pi_K u = & \frac{h_x^4}{4!}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}\left(\xi^2 - 1\right)^2 + \frac{h_y^4}{4!}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial y^4}\left(\eta^2 - 1\right)^2 \\ & + \frac{h_x^2 h_y^2}{4}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\left(\xi^2 - 1\right)\left(\eta^2 - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial x^2} &= \frac{h_x^2}{4!}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4}\left(12\xi^2 - 4\right) + \frac{h_y^2}{2}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\left(\eta^2 - 1\right), \\ \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial y^2} &= \frac{h_y^2}{4!}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial y^4}\left(12\eta^2 - 4\right) + \frac{h_x^2}{2}\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\left(\xi^2 - 1\right), \\ \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial x \partial y} &= h_x h_y \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\xi\eta. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

A combination of (3.8) and (3.9) plus some elementary calculation give

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial x^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}dxdy &= -\frac{h_y^2}{3}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}dxdy, \\ \int_K \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2}dxdy &= -\frac{h_x^2}{3}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2}dxdy, \\ \int_K \frac{\partial^2(u - \Pi_K u)}{\partial x \partial y}\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x \partial y}dxdy &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

which completes the proof. □

The above lemma can be used to prove the following crucial lower bound.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that* $w \in H_0^2(\Omega) \cap H^4(\Omega)$. *Then,*

$$\beta h^2 \leq (\nabla_h^2(w - \Pi_h w), \nabla_h^2 \Pi_h w)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{3.11}$$

for some positive constant β *which is independent of the meshsize* h *provided that* $|\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x \partial y}|_{H^1(\Omega)} \neq 0$ *and that the meshsize is small enough.*

Proof. Given $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let the interpolation operator P_K be defined as in (3.4), which leads to the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}&(\nabla_h^2(w-\Pi_h w), \nabla_h^2 \Pi_h w)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} (\nabla^2(P_K w - \Pi_K P_K w), \nabla^2 \Pi_K w)_{L^2(K)}\\ &\quad + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} (\nabla^2 (I-\Pi_K)(I-P_K)w, \nabla^2\Pi_K w)_{L^2(K)}\\ &= I_1 + I_2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Let $u = P_K w$ and $v = \Pi_k w$ in Lemma 3.1. The first term I_1 on the right-hand side of (3.12) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 = &-\frac{h_y^2}{3}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 P_K w}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 \Pi_K w}{\partial x^2} dxdy\\ &-\frac{h_x^2}{3}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 P_K w}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 \Pi_K w}{\partial y^2} dxdy.\end{aligned}$$

This, error estimates of (3.2), and the commuting property of (3.5) yield

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 = &-\frac{h_y^2}{3}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 w}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} dxdy\\ &-\frac{h_x^2}{3}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\int_K \frac{\partial^4 w}{\partial x^2 \partial y^2}\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} dxdy\\ &+\mathcal{O}(h^2)\|(I-\Pi_0)\nabla^4 w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^3(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2} = 0$ (resp. $\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} = 0$) on the boundary parallel to the x-axis (resp. the y-axis), an elementwise integration by parts plus the uniformity of the mesh prove

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 = &\frac{h_y^2}{3}\|\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x^2 \partial y}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{h_x^2}{3}\|\frac{\partial^3 w}{\partial x \partial y^2}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\\ &+\mathcal{O}(h^2)\|(I-\Pi_0)\nabla^4 w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^3(\Omega)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

The second term I_2 on the right-hand side of (3.12) can be estimated by error estimates of (3.2) and the commuting property of (3.5), which reads

$$|I_2| \le Ch^2\|(I-\Pi_0)\nabla^4 w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|w\|_{H^3(\Omega)}. \tag{3.14}$$

Since the piecewise constant functions are dense in the space $L^2(\Omega)$,

$$\|(I-\Pi_0)\nabla^4 w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0 \text{ when } h \to 0.$$

Hence, a combination of (3.12)-(3.14) proves the desired result. ☐

Remark 3.3. *The expansion* (3.7) *was analyzed in* [4, 9, 19]*. Herein we give a new and much simpler proof. Moreover, compared with the regularity* H^5 *needed therein, the analysis herein only needs the regularity* H^4*.*

Remark 3.4. *The idea herein can be directly extended to the eigenvalue problem investigated in* [4, 19]*, which improves and simplifies the analysis therein and proves that the discrete eigenvalue produced by the Adini element is smaller than the exact one provided that the meshsize is sufficiently small. In addition, such a generalization weakens the regularity condition from* $u \in H^5(\Omega)$ *to* $u \in H^4(\Omega)$ *where* u *is the eigenfunction.*

4. A LOWER BOUND OF THE ERROR ESTIMATE IN THE L^2 NORM

This section proves the main result of this paper, namely, a lower bound of the error estimate in the L^2 norm. The main ingredients are the lower bound in Lemma 3.2 and an identity for $(-f, w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}$ which will be established in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* w *and* w_h *be solutions of problems* (2.1) *and* (2.4)*, respectively. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}&(-f, w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&= a_h(w, \Pi_h w - w_h) - (f, \Pi_h w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\quad + a_h(w - \Pi_h w, w - \Pi_h w) + a_h(w - \Pi_h w, w_h - \Pi_h w)\\&\quad + 2(f, \Pi_h w - w)_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2a_h(w - \Pi_h w, \Pi_h w).\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. We start with the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}&(-f, w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&= (-f, w - w_h) + a_h(w, w - w_h) - a_h(w, w - w_h)\\&= (-f, w - \Pi_h w)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (-f, \Pi_h w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}\\&\quad + a(w, \Pi_h w - w_h) + a_h(w, w - \Pi_h w) - a_h(w, w - w_h).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The last two terms on the right-hand side of (4.2) allow for a further decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}&a_h(w, w - \Pi_h w) - a_h(w, w - w_h)\\&= a_h(w - \Pi_h w, w - \Pi_h w) + a_h(\Pi_h w, w - \Pi_h w)\\&\quad - a_h(w - \Pi_h w, w - w_h) - a_h(\Pi_h w, w - w_h)\\&= a_h(w - \Pi_h w, w_h - \Pi_h w) + a_h(\Pi_h w, w - \Pi_h w)\\&\quad - a_h(\Pi_h w, w - w_h).\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

It follows from the discrete problem (2.4) and the continuous problem (2.1) that the last term on the right-hand side of (4.3) can be divided as

$$\begin{aligned} & - a_h(\Pi_h w, w - w_h) \\ & = (f, \Pi_h w - w)_{L^2(\Omega)} - a_h(w, \Pi_h w - w) \\ & = (f, \Pi_h w - w)_{L^2(\Omega)} - a_h(w - \Pi_h w, \Pi_h w - w) \\ & \quad - a_h(\Pi_h w, \Pi_h w - w). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

A summary of (4.2)-(4.4) completes the proof. □

Remark 4.2. *The importance of the identity of* (4.1) *lies in that such a decomposition separates the dominant term* $2a_h(w-\Pi_h w, \Pi_h w)$ *from the other higher order terms, which is the key to employ Lemma 3.2.*

For the analysis, we list two results from [8] and [9, 10].

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $w \in H_0^2(\Omega) \cap H^4(\Omega)$ *be the solution of problem* (2.1). *It holds that*

$$|a_h(w, v_h) - (f, v_h)| \leq Ch^2 |w|_{H^4(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h^2 v_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \text{ for any } v_h \in W_h. \tag{4.5}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let* w *and* w_h *be solutions of problems* (2.1) *and* (2.4), *respectively. Suppose that* $w \in H_0^2(\Omega) \cap H^4(\Omega)$. *Then,*

$$\|\nabla_h^2 (w - w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch^2 |w|_{H^4(\Omega)}. \tag{4.6}$$

Theorem 4.5. *Let* w *and* w_h *be solutions of problems* (2.1) *and* (2.4), *respectively. Suppose that* $w \in H_0^2(\Omega) \cap H^4(\Omega)$. *Then, there exists a positive constant* α *which is independent of the meshsize such that*

$$\alpha h^2 \leq \|w - w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{4.7}$$

provided that $|\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x \partial y}|_{H^1(\Omega)} \neq 0$ *and* $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \neq 0$ *and that the meshsize is small enough.*

Proof. We shall first bound the terms of the identity from Lemma 4.1. The first two terms on the right-hand side of (4.1) can be bounded by Lemmas 4.3-4.4, and estimates of (3.2), which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & |a_h(w, \Pi_h w - w_h) - (f, \Pi_h w - w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \\ & \leq Ch^2 |w|_{H^4(\Omega)} \|\nabla_h^2 (\Pi_h w - w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq Ch^2 \big(\|\nabla_h^2 (\Pi_h w - w)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_h^2 (w - w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \big) \\ & \leq Ch^4 |w|_{H^4(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates of the third and fifth terms on the right-hand side of (4.1) follow immediately from (3.2), which gives

$$\begin{aligned}&|a_h(w-\Pi_h w, w-\Pi_h w)+2(f,\Pi_h w-w)_{L^2(\Omega)}|\\&\leq Ch^4\big(|w|_{H^4(\Omega)}+\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\big)|w|_{H^4(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the triangle inequality, Lemma 4.4, and (3.2) it follows that

$$|a_h(w-\Pi_h w, w_h-\Pi_h w)|\leq Ch^4|w|^2_{H^4(\Omega)}.$$

The last term on the right hand-side of (4.1) has already been analyzed in Lemma 3.2, which reads

$$\beta h^2\leq(\nabla_h^2(w-\Pi_h w),\nabla_h^2\Pi_h w)_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

for some positive constant β. A combination of these estimates states

$$\delta h^2\leq(-f,w-w_h)_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

for some positive constant δ which is independent of the meshsize provided that the meshsize is small enough. This plus the definition of the L^2 norm of $w-w_h$ proves

$$\|w-w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=\sup_{0\neq d\in L^2(\Omega)}\frac{(d,w-w_h)}{\|d\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}\geq\frac{(-f,w-w_h)}{\|-f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}\geq\delta/\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}h^2.$$

Setting $\alpha=\delta/\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ completes the proof. □

Remark 4.6. *For the rectangular domain* Ω *under consideration, the condition* $|\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x\partial y}|_{H^1(\Omega)}\neq 0$ *holds provided that* $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\neq 0$. *In fact, if* $|\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x\partial y}|_{H^1(\Omega)}=0$, w *is of form*

$$w=c_0xy+h(x)+g(y),$$

for some function $h(x)$ *with respect to* x, *and* $g(y)$ *with respect to* y. *Then, the boundary condition concludes that both* $h(x)$ *and* $g(y)$ *are constant. Hence the boundary condition indicates* $w\equiv 0$, *which contradicts with* $w\not\equiv 0$.

Remark 4.7. *By the Poincare inequality, it follows that*

$$\alpha h^2\leq\|\nabla(w-w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

for some positive constant α *independent of the meshsize provided that* $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\neq 0$ *and that the meshsize is small enough.*

5. The conclusion and comments

This paper presents the analysis of the error estimate of the Adini element in the L^2 norm. It is proved that the best error estimate in the L^2 norm is at most of order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ which can not be improved in general. This result solves a long standing open problem in the literature: whether convergence rates in L^2 and H^1 norms are higher than that in the energy norm for the Adini element on the uniform mesh. This result in fact indicates that the nonconforming Adini element space can not contain any conforming space with an appropriate approximate property. This will cause further difficulty for the a posteriori error analysis. In fact, the reliable and efficient a posteriori error estimate for this element is still missed in the literature, see [2] for more details.

References

[1] S. C. Brenner, L. R. Scott, The mathematical theory of finite element methods, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[2] C. Carstensen, D. Gallistl, and J. Hu, A posteriori error estimates for nonconforming finite element methods for fourth-order problems on rectangles, Numer. Math. DOI 10.1007/s00211-012-0513-5.

[3] P. G. Ciarlet, The finite element method for elliptic problems, North–Holland, 1978; reprinted as SIAM Classics in Applied Mathematics, 2002.

[4] J. Hu and Y. Q. Huang, The correction operator for the canonical interpolation operator of the Adini element and the lower bounds of eigenvalues, Science China Mathematics, 55(2012), pp. 187–196.

[5] J. Hu, Y. Q. Huang, and Q. Lin, The lower bounds for eigenvalues of elliptic operators by nonconforming finite element methods, arXiv:1112.1145v1[math.NA] 6 Dec 2011.

[6] J. Hu, Y. Q. Huang and S. Y. Zhang, The lowest order differentiable finite element on rectangular grids, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 49(2011), pp. 1350–1368.

[7] J. Hu and Z. C. Shi, The best L^2 norm error estimate of the lower order finite element methods for the fourth order problem, J. Comput. Math., 30(2012), pp. 449–460.

[8] P. Lascaux and P. Lesaint, Some nonconforming finite elements for the plate bending problem, RAIRO Anal. Numer., 9 (1975), pp. 9–53.

[9] P. Luo and Q. Lin, High accuracy analysis of the Adini's nonconforming element, Computing, 68(2002), pp. 65–79.

[10] S. P. Mao and S. C. Chen, Accuracy analysis of Adinis non-conforming plate element on anisotropic meshes, Commun. Numer. Meth. Engng., 22(2006), pp. 433–440.

[11] L. S. D. Morley, The triangular equilibrium element in the solutions of plate bending problem, Aero. Quart., 19(1968), pp. 149–169.

[12] M. J. D. Powell and M. A. Sabin, Piecewise quadratic approximations on triangles, ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, 3-4 (1977), pp. 316–325.

[13] Z. C. Shi, On the convergence of the incomplete biqudratic nonconforming plate element, Math. Numer. Sinica, 8(1986), pp. 53–62.
[14] Z. C. Shi and M. Wang, The finite element method (in Chinese), Science Press, Beijing, 2010.
[15] M. Wang, Z. C. Shi and J. C. Xu, Some n-rectangle nonconforming elements for fourth order elliptic equations, J. Comp. Math. 25(2007), pp. 408–420.
[16] M. Wang and J. C. Xu, The Morley element for fourth order elliptic equations in any dimensions, Numer. Math., 103(2006), pp. 155–169.
[17] M. Wang and J. C. Xu, Minimal finite element spaces for 2m-th order partial differential equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Math. Comp., 82(2012), pp. 25–43.
[18] M. Q. Wu, The incomplete biquadratic nonconforming plate element (in Chinese), Journal of Suzhou University, 1(1983), pp. 20–29.
[19] Y. D. Yang, A posteriori error estimates in Adini finite element for eigenvalue problems, J. Comp. Math., 18(2000), pp. 413–418.

LMAM and School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P. R. China
E-mail address: `hujun@math.pku.edu.cn`

LSEC, ICMSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China.
E-mail address: `shi@lsec.cc.ac.cn`